

Applicant amended the claims to replace "utilising" with "utilizing". Further, Applicant amended claim 46 to delete the words "first" and "second". Therefore, the phrase "an second" was eliminated. Applicant submits that the informalities pointed out by the Examiner have been corrected and therefore, Applicant requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the specification indicating that the phrase "utilising the map" should be replaced by "utilizing the map". By this amendment, Applicant has corrected the specification accordingly and therefore, requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 30-33, 38-49, 54-62 and 65 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the claims are indefinite because "storing on a second information server computer" makes the claim confusing since Applicant does not indicate a previous information server computer or a first information server computer. By this amendment, Applicant amended the claims to delete the words "first" and "second" when referring to either a map server computer or an information server computer. Therefore, Applicant submits that the amended claims are not indefinite and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 30-32, 40-44, 46-48, 56 and 63-66 under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,682,525 to Bouve et al. (Bouve"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner, on page 7 of the Official Action, rejected Applicant's previous argument which stated, "Bouve is entirely different from the claimed invention in that Bouve discloses using a single database storage memory 139 for holding both map data and information relating to items of interest." The Examiner disagreed stating that, "Bouve also discloses an additional database storage 139a (See Col. 12, line 24-27)." Applicant wishes to point out that Col. 12, lines 24-27 of Bouve states that an additional database storage memory 139a stores information which is accessible by the system data server 137 and which stores information such as system usage and transaction logging. Further, Fig. 9 shows database storage 139a with a caption, "system usage, transaction logging, and administration databases." Therefore, Applicant submits that Bouve does, in fact, disclose using a single database storage memory 139 for holding both map data and information relating to items of interest. Database storage 139a holds information relating to system usage, transaction logging, and administration databases, and does not hold either map data or information relating to items of interest.

Claims 30-32 and 40-44 recite a method of operating a computer system comprising storing on a map server computer coordinate data indicative of spatial coordinates of at least one point associated with a geographical area represented by a map, so as to enable correlation of points on the map with a corresponding geographical location, and storing on an information server information data relating to at least one place of interest within the geographical area, the information data including data representative of the spatial coordinates of the place of interest within the area.

Bouve discloses a system for remotely determining a position of a selected category of items of interest in a selected geographic vicinity from a database. As mentioned previously,

Bouve discloses using a single database storage memory 139 for holding both map data and information relating to items of interest. The additional database storage 139a does not hold either map data or information relating to items of interest.

Similarly, claims 46-48 and 56 recite a computer system comprising a map server computer for storing map data representative of a map of a geographical area and coordinate data representative of the spatial coordinates of at least one point lying within the area represented by the map, and an information server computer for storing information representative of at least one place of interest within the geographical area, the data including data representative of the spatial coordinates of the place of interest within the area. For the reasons mentioned above, Bouve does not disclose both a map server computer and an information server computer. In fact, Bouve only discloses a single database for holding both map data and information relating to items of interest.

Similarly, claim 65 recites a client computer comprising means for transmitting a map request to a map server computer to request transfer to the client computer of map data, and means for transmitting an information request to an information server computer to identify places of interest known to the information server computer and lying within a geographical area. For the reasons mentioned above, Bouve does not disclose a client computer having the above-mentioned limitations.

Claim 64 recites the previously discussed limitations of claim 46 and is not anticipated by Bouve at least for the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 65 and 66 recite the client computer comprising means for transmitting a map request to a map server computer to request transfer to the client computer of map data, and means for transmitting an information request to an information server computer to identify

places of interest known to the information server computer and lying within a geographical area. For the reasons previously mentioned, Applicant submits that Bouve does not disclose the above-mentioned limitations.

Because Bouve does not disclose each and every feature of the claims, Applicant submits that the claims are not anticipated by Bouve and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 38, 39, 54, 55, and 57-62 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bouve in view of reference XP 000612712 of Arikawa ("Arikawa"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant observed that for retrieving information from the Internet, the lack of a physical "place" is an advantage. A consumer, no matter where his location, is presented with a familiar interface, which makes access very straightforward. However, the Internet or Worldwide Web is not well suited to answering questions about places and proximity. For example, it was not possible to use existing web search tools to answer questions such as "Where is the nearest hamburger restaurant?".

Applicant addresses the above problem by developing a method, as recited in claim 30, of operating a computer system comprising storing, on a map server computer, map data representative of a map of a geographical area, and storing, on a second information server computer, data relating to at least one place of interest within a geographical area. The map data is utilized to display an image of the map on a visual data unit associated with a client computer. The client computer transmits an information request to an information server computer and the information server computer transmits to the client computer in response to the information request, information data relating to at least one place of interest within the

geographical area. Information data relating to at least one place of interest is displayed on a visual display unit.

As previously mentioned, Bouve teaches using a single database memory on a single physical computer to hold both map data and information relating to items of interest. Bouve does not disclose any other database storage memory for holding either map data or information relating to items of interest.

Arikawa teaches so called "dynamic maps" being built up or assembled. Arikawa teaches that the various geographic databases store sets of data or certain facilities. However, Arikawa does not disclose, teach, or suggest storing, on a map server computer, map data representative of a map of a geographical area and storing, on an information server computer, information data relating to at least one place of interest within a geographical area, as recited in claims 38-39, and as similarly recited in remaining claims. Arikawa discloses that visualization methods create a dynamic map from database views. The database views are defined by a set of queries which can be only applied to a geographic database, such as a river database and an administrative area database. (See page 592, second col., second paragraph).

Neither Bouve nor Arikawa disclose, teach or suggest, either separately or in combination using a map server computer and an information server computer, as recited in the claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

All rejections and objections having been addressed, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY MADISON & SUTRO LLP

By: Richard C. Irving  
Richard C. Irving  
Reg. No. 38,499  
Tel. (202) 861-3788  
Fax No.: (202) 822-0944

DSL/RCI:ksh

100 New York Avenue, N.W  
9<sup>th</sup> Floor, East Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3918  
Tel: (202) 861-3000